



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

VOLUME XXXV

JANUARY 1919

NUMBER 2

THE BABYLONIAN EMPIRE

By A. T. OLMSTEAD
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

The long agony of Babylonia under the sway of the barbarian Guti¹ was brought to an end by the Shumerian Utu hegal. In an inscription unique for freshness of expression among the royal records of early Babylonia he tells us of his operations. Gutium is the "dragon of the mountains, the enemy of the gods, which had ravished the wife from her husband, their infants from the parents, and caused woe and evil in the land." Utu hegal, the king of Uruk, the king of the Four World Regions, prayed to Innanna for aid, since Enlil had granted to him that the kingdom of Shumer should be independent. Meanwhile the Guti king, Tirigan, had thought, "No one will come against me, the Tigris has flooded the country, below in Shumer it has covered the fields, it has covered the roads, the roads of the land are covered with torn-off plants." From Uruk, Utu hegal sallied forth and moored his boat at the temple of Ishkurra, whence issued his proclamation to the people, informing them that Enlil had given him Gutium, that the lady Innanna was his aid, that the old hero of Uruk, Gilgamesh, had given him protection. To the

¹ The present article continues the study of the political development of Babylonia begun in *AJSL*, XXXIII, 283 ff., to which reference may be made for general bibliography and introduction.

people of Uruk and Kullab he brought joy of heart; his city like one man marched behind him; to the same purpose they turned their face. From the temple of Ishkurra he weighed anchor. In five days he came to the dam of Ilitabbeke, where the lieutenants of Tirigan arrived with a message and were captured. On the sixth day Utu hegal anchored at Muru; the wall of Gutium he broke through; soldiers he brought within. Tirigan, alone and on foot, fled to his fortress of Dubrum. The people of that town, knowing that Utu hegal was the king to whom Enlil had given the might, gave not the hand to Tirigan. Through the messenger of Utu hegal they made Tirigan, his wife, and his children prisoners in Dubrum; on his hands they placed fetters. Utu hegal took him. Prostrate before his conqueror the Gutu king threw himself, and Utu hegal placed his feet on his neck. So Utu hegal established Shumer in its independence and began the fifth and last dynasty of Uruk (2500+ B.C.).¹ Yet it was Tirigan and not Utu hegal who was remembered a thousand years hence as the founder of a city.

Utu hegal may have restored Babylonia to freedom; he does not restore it to the light of history. In this period of darkness, when we cannot even guess the succession of the greater rulers, we have a large number of known patesis at Lagash. Their rule endures but a short time, they appear to belong to different dynasties, and they make no claim to foreign conquests; their only importance is that through them alone can we secure any idea of this period of our history.

The immediate successor of Lugal ushumgal, the friend of Naram Sin and of Shargali sharri, seems to have been Ur Babbar,² and Ur E was not far distant in time.³ Lugal Bur must also be placed in the earliest part of this period.⁴ The next group in point of time is made up of Basha Mama,⁵ Ur Mama,⁶ and Ugme,⁷ of whom we have dated

¹ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, IX, 111 ff.; duplicate, *ibid.*, X, 99; cf. *CR Acad.*, 1912, 160 f.; Omen Texts, *ibid.*, 120; cf. M. Wetzell, *Babyloniaca*, VII, 51 ff. Poebel, *Texts*, No. 2, gives Agade, Gutium, Isin, in succession, which means that the scribe recognized no new city ruler between. The parallel and nearly complete list of Lagash patesis barely fills the 190 years from Shargali sharri to the end of the Gutu rule.

² *RTC*, 83, 132.

³ *Ibid.*, 83; cf. King, *Sumer*, 254, n. 2.

⁴ *SAK*, 59, n. 1.

⁵ *RTC*, 181.

⁶ *SAK*, 58 f.; *RTC*, 184.

⁷ *RTC*, 183, 259; cf. Thureau-Dangin. *RA*, V, 68

business documents. Ur Bau is somewhat less of a shadow, for we have his statue, with mention of a building operation, a series of bricks, and other brief inscriptions, as well as a date formula which tells us of his irrigation work.¹ Nammahni, his successor, is likewise a little less of a shadow, for we have, in addition to a date formula, various brief inscriptions, a female statue dedicated to his mother, Nin kagina, and a mace head dedicated by his wife, Nin gandu, which shows that he was the son-in-law of Ur Bau.² Another daughter of Ur Bau dedicates a statue for Ur Gar, who also belongs to this period.³ A bowl inscription is all that has saved Ur Ninsun from oblivion,⁴ while Ka azag, Galu Bau, and Galu Gula are known only from date formulas.⁵ Of the patesis of other cities in this period we know Galu Utu of Umma.⁶

A strange sensation it is to emerge from this darkness to the light in which appears the best-known figure in the earlier Babylonian history. Not that Gudea was such a great ruler; he was but a mere patesi, not even an independent monarch. He could claim no hereditary right to the throne, for he does not name his father, and the only family reason for his succession must be found in his marriage with Ninkalla, the daughter of his predecessor, Ur Bau. His only war was against the "City of Anshan in Elam." It is to his buildings, his sculptures, above all to his writings, that we owe our sense of his reality as a most unusual individual. Though we must assume that he was dependent upon a king who ruled elsewhere, yet he says not a word about such an overlord in all his voluminous records. He boasts that he made trips for building supplies to the outposts of civilization in such a way that scholars have mistaken them for military expeditions, and there is no hint that the Elamite campaign was

¹ *Dec*, 7 f.; iv ff.; Amiaud, *RP*², I, 75 ff.; Oppert, *CR Acad.*, 1882, 39; cf. Hommel, *ZK*, II, 185; Le Gac, *ZA*, VII, 125 ff.; Jensen, *KB*, 18 ff.; *SAK*, 58 f., *Dec*, 8 bis, 2; 26, 1; 27, 2; 37, 1, 2; 38; xxxi; Amiaud, *RP*, 73 f.; Radau, *Hist.*, 182 ff.; Jensen, *KB*, 24 f.; *SAK*, 60 ff.; Rogers, *Hist.*, II, op. p. 42; *VS*, I, 11; Boscauwen, *First of Empires*, 134 f.; *RTC*, 185.

² *RTC*, 187. Brick, *Dec*, 37, 10; xxxiii; Amiaud, *RP*, II, 107; Ledrain, *Rev. Critique*, 1883, II, 220; Hommel, *ZK*, II, 184. Sill, *Dec*, 27, 1; Jensen, 68 ff. Bowl, Heuzey, *RA*, II, 79; IV, 121; Jensen, *KB*, 74. Mace head, *CT*, I, 50; Radau, *Hist.*, 186 f.; *SAK*, 62 ff. Heuzey, *Villa*, 3, 35. *VS*, I, 12.

³ *SAK*, 64 f.; cf. *RTC*, 186.

⁴ Heuzey-Oppert, *RA*, II, 79; Jensen, *KB*, 76 f.

⁵ *RTC*, 188 ff.

⁶ Cone, *CT*, I, 50; *RT*, XXI, 125; King, *Sumer*, op. p. 258; Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 14.

carried out in the train of some conqueror. His buildings too are on a royal scale and must have required great wealth, yet he would have us know that it was not at the expense of the common people. Not until the very latest days of Babylonia was there to arise another such king to tell so much of himself. Measured by mere number of words, his inscriptions cover as much ground as all the others discussed in this article. Even such a comparison is not quite fair to Gudea. The vast majority of these records are of the most monotonous character and have but little to offer to the historian. Those of Gudea have a real literary value, and they throw light upon almost every phase of the culture life. All the more strange is it that they throw no light on the problems of the political history.¹

Gudea was succeeded by his son Ur Ningirsu, who reigned as patesi at least three years.² Shortly after the conquest of Lagash by the founder of the new Ur dynasty, Ur Engur, he was deposed and his place was taken by Ur Abba.³ Ur Ningirsu seems, however, to have retained at least a part of his functions, the religious, and we find him still, as high priest of Anu, high priest of Nana, and priest of Enki, placing his name on temple bricks, and one of his subordinates dedicates a votive wig for the life of Dungi, the second king of the new dynasty.⁴

¹ For his family relations cf. Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VII, 85, a restoration of the inscription of Gudea's wife. The reference to Anshan is in Statue B. VI. 64 ff. Johns, *Cuneiform Inscriptions*, 25, finds a synchronism with Dungi, but the Gudea of Kutu is evidently not the same. The inscriptions of historical value are: Statues, *Dec*, 9, 13 ff.; 20; vi ff.; Amiaud, *ZK*, I, 156, 233 ff.; *ZA*, II, 287 ff.; III, 23 ff.; *RP*², II, 75 ff.; Ledrain, *Rev. Crit.*, 1883, II, 260; Halévy, *RT*, XI, 190 ff.; Radau, *Hist.*, 191 ff.; Oppert, *V Kongr. Or.*, II, 1, 235 ff.; *CR Acad.*, 1882, 34 ff., 124; Jensen, *KB*, 26 ff.; Scheil, *RT*, XII, 195 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VI, 23 ff.; *SAK*, 66 ff.; Martin, *RT*, XXIV, 190 ff. Cylinders, *Dec*, 33 ff.; Price, *The Great Cylinder Inscription of Gudea* (a new edition in preparation); Toscanne, *Les Cylindres de Gudea*; Zimmern, *ZA*, III, 232 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *CR Acad.*, 1901, 112 ff.; *ZA*, XVI, 344 ff.; XVII, 181 ff.; XVIII, 119 ff.; *Les Cylindres de Gudea*; *SAK*, 88 ff. The minor inscriptions have no additional historical value; cf. for further bibliography *SAK*, 140 ff., and note in addition *VS*, I, 13 ff., from el Hibbeh and Surghul. In addition to the discussion in the usual manuals note H. H. Howorth, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XVII, 209 ff. By an unaccountable slip his well-known articles on the earlier period, *ibid.*, XIII, 1 ff., were omitted from the bibliography of the earlier article.

² Brick, *Dec*, 37, 9; xxxiii; Amiaud, *RP*², II, 106; Jensen, *KB*, 66 f.; Menant, *Coll. de Clercq*, II, 9, 4; *CT*, X, 2; XXXIII, 50; *SAK*, 146 ff.; *RTC*, 207, 210 f.

³ *RTC*, 261, 287 ff.; for connection with Ur Engur cf. Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, V, 7.

⁴ *Dec*, 37, 8; 26, 5; xxxiii; Amiaud, *RP*², II, 106; Jensen, *KB*, 66 f.; *SAK*, 146 f. *CT*, V, 2; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 157, No. 9; cf. p. 42; Jensen, *KB*, 68 f.; *SAK*, 144 ff. Reference to precious objects from Lagash, dated in the patesiate of Ur Ningirsu, and destined for the king and other members of the royal family, *SAK*, 70; *RTC*, v; King, *Sumer*, 276.

This new dynasty opens a new period in the history of Babylonia.¹ With it we begin to have a fairly connected story, whereas so dense is the preceding darkness that we do not even know what was the power which Ur supplanted, or whether there was in truth any such power which could claim the lordship over all Babylonia. All we do know is that at the beginning of his reign Ur Engur held only the city of Ur² and that here the first measure undertaken must be the rebuilding of the city wall as a measure of protection.³ His first conquest made him "Lord" of Uruk.⁴ About the same time came the capture of Lagash, for the year following the installation of Ur Abba as patesi is marked in the date formulas by that of Ur Engur's son as high priest of Innanna in Uruk.⁵ That Larsa belonged to his kingdom is proved by a building inscription, and others show his lordship over Nippur, Adab, and Umma.⁶ At Lagash he dug a boundary canal which reminds us of the one dug long centuries before between that city and its rival Umma.⁷

After the conquest of Nippur, Ur Engur assumed the title "King of Shumer and Akkad,"⁸ though the only portion of North Babylonia that we may conjecture belonged to him was Ishkun Sin, whose patesi Hashhamer made a dedication in his honor.⁹ That Ur Ungur actually did make at least one expedition into this part of Babylonia

¹ Inscriptions of the dynasty collected and discussed, C. G. Janneau, *Dynastie chaldéenne*, 1911.

² Brick and door sill. Inscriptions of Ur Engur's reign, I R.I.; *CT*, XXI, 2 ff.; Oppert, *Exped.*, I, 261; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 35 ff.; Menant, *Bab. Chald.*, 74 ff.; Lenormant, *Etud.*, II, 303 ff.; Winckler, *KB*, 76 ff.; *SAK*, 186 ff.; Clay, *Light*, 105; Banks, *Bismya*, 425; King-Hall, *Egypt and Western Asia*, 188; Janneau, *Dyn. Chald.*, 4 ff. Johns, *Ur Engur*.

³ Brick, *CT*, XXI, 2; date formula, King, *Sumer*, 280, n. 2.

⁴ Brick C, *CT*, XXI, 7; Brick D, *CT*, XXI, 3; King, *Sumer*, op. p. 280; cf. Brick F, to Anu, god of Uruk, Lenormant, *Choix des Textes*, 60; *CT*, XXI, 9.

⁵ *RTC*, 264.

⁶ Larsa, Brick E; Banks, *Bismya*, 417. Nippur, Brick G; Sillas A, B, *OBI*, 121; note, however, that Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 28, n. 1, argues that they originally came from Adab; tablet, *OBI*, 14; 122; Radau, *Hist.*, 222. Adab, Banks, *Bismya*, 144; Poebel, *Texts*, No. 7. Umma, Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 16.

⁷ Cone B, Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 186 f. *RA*, VI, 79 ff. King, *Sumer*, 281, takes it as between Lagash and Ur.

⁸ Bricks C-E, G, Cone B, Sillas A, B, tablet, cf. King, *Sumer*, 281; Janneau, *Dynastie chald.*, 5.

⁹ Ker Porter, *Travels*, II, 79, 6; I R. 1, 1, 10; Menant, *Glyptique*, IV, 2; *British Museum Guide*, xxiii, 1.

is proved by a date formula which tells how he "took his way from the Lower to the Upper Country."¹

Thus we may piece together the formal statements in the royal records. Further hints we find in a hymn. We hear of the city wall of Ur, fallen through age, of the palace burned by fire, of the plundered home of the shepherd, his wife lost, his son not permitted to grow up on his knees. But Ur Engur, the brother of Gilgamesh, became the shepherd of the people. The deities had compassion on him, those he plundered followed him in tears; his ships were seen in places hitherto unknown; the faithful wood of the oars brought its wealth to Gu edin; at the same time came the gifts of Kish. There was a rebellion, but the foe who was hostile to the land was thrown down, the chariot overthrown, and the expedition annihilated, though the leader was not captured. The seven foreign lands brought gifts; at the name of Ur Engur terror was felt in the foreign lands. The lands were at peace.²

The eighteen-year reign of Ur Engur (2481-2463 B.C.)³ had resulted in a remarkable increase of power for the Ur dynasty, and he well deserved all the praises of the scribe. It is a curious commentary on the opinions of men that, unlike his successors, he was not deified, either in his lifetime or in the lifetime of his deified descendants.⁴ His son Dungi, in his long rule of fifty-eight years (2463-2405 B.C.), secured deification, and few Babylonian monarchs before or since have so amply deserved it because of their extension of their dominions. All the more must we regret that we can learn of but a small part of these glories from his own records.⁵ To be sure, we have inscriptions which prove all South Babylonia to have been under his control, Nippur, Adab, Umma, Lagash, the nearby

¹ *RTC*, 261 ff.

² Langdon, *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*, 126 ff.

³ These dates are exact within the dynasty, our only difficulty being accurate connection with the astronomically fixed dates of the first dynasty of Babylon. This depends on the date given for the fall of Rim Sin. See below., pp. 86, 95.

⁴ Cf. Langdon, *op. cit.*, 127. But he did have a temple.

⁵ Inscriptions of reign, I R. 2; *CT*, XXI, 10 f.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 36; Menant, *Glyptique*, IV, 2; Winckler, *KB*, 80 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 186 ff.; Lenormant, 313; Radau, *Hist.*, 224 ff.; King, *Sumer*, *op. p.* 288; Schrader, *ZDMG*, XXIX, 39; *VS*, I, 24; Janneau, *Dynastie Chald.*, 8 ff.; Scheil, *ZA*, XI, 85; Clay, *Light*, 286. The date formulas, *OBI*, 125 ff.; *SAK*, 229 ff.; Hilprecht, *Math. Texts*, No. 46; Myrhrman, *Sumerian Administrative Documents*, 21 ff.; Janneau, *Dynastie*, *passim*.

Dungi Babbar, whose name identified the king with the sun-god, but only his inscriptions from the Elamite capital point to actual conquests.¹

Susa apparently was brought into the Ur sphere of influence before North Babylonia was invaded,² but it was still early in the reign when Babylon was attacked and the "treasures of the temple Esagila and of the city of Babylon were carried out as spoil." The indignant citizen who, at a later date, wrote this down also tells us that "Dungi sought after evil" and points the moral by informing us that the Babylonian city god Bel made an end of him in consequence. Rarely has history been so miswritten by the later historian, for Dungi continued to go on from conquest to conquest. From this same jaundiced observer we learn that Eridu, far south "on the shore of the sea," was well treated, an additional insult in the eyes of our historian.³ Soon after the conquest of Babylon came that of Kutu, and he could rightfully call himself "King of the Four World Regions." Unlike Babylon, Kutu was well treated. A later scribe has preserved a copy of the inscription which Dungi set up when he restored its temple, and it is significant that it is written in the Semitic Babylonian.⁴

Little attempt was made by Dungi to incorporate the various city states formally into his empire, but we need not on that account burden our pages with the patesis who held ghostly rule throughout Babylonia. Lagash will serve as a sufficient example. At the beginning of the reign Ur Abba was ruling. He was followed by Galu kazal. By the thirty-ninth year he was succeeded by Galu andal, and he in turn was followed by Ur Lama from the forty-second

¹ Lagash, cone, sill, Tablets B, C, *Dec*, 29, 3 f.; xxxiii; Amiaud, *RP*², II, 109. Dungi Babbar, Seal E. Adab, Banks, *Bismya*, 133 f.; Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 28, n. 1. Umma, Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 17. Nippur, Tablet E, Votive Statue B, *OBI*, No. 15 f.; 125; I, 31. Susa, Brick C, Tablet I, Bead, Scheil, *Del*, IV, 8; XIV, 22 f.

² The absence of the title "King of the Four World Regions" in the Susa inscription may indicate that it is before the conquest of North Babylonia, but note that he does not bear this title in the inscription from Kutu, which of course is in North Babylonia!

³ Chron., II, 5 ff. King, *Sumer*, 283, is certainly not correct in believing that this proves Esagila to have been the most important shrine in North Babylonia. The conquest took place before the year 53, when Arshih was patesi of Babylon, Genouillac, *Drehem*, 1. Borsippa is ruled in the second year of Bur Sin, Lau, *Records*, No. 159.

⁴ Lenormant, *Choix*, 61; Schrader, *ZDMG*, XXIX, 37; Amiaud, *ZA*, III, 94 f.; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 209, n. 2; 547; *SAK*, 190 f.

to at least the forty-eighth year. Two years later we find Alla. The very next year he was succeeded by the same or another Ur Lama, who clung to his place until the third year of Bur Sin. Little perusal of these lists is needed to show that, whatever the theory, in practice these are mere governors, that the empire is in a very real sense a unity, and that our history need trouble itself little as to the majority of these ephemeral officials.¹

More extensive yet were the foreign wars of Dungi, but we hear of them only when they were considered important enough to date the year. The first advance beyond Babylon and Kutu had taken place by the nineteenth and twentieth years, when we find under Dungi's control the city of Der, important as commanding the exit from the Elamite Mountains, and Kazallu, the land just to the north. In his twenty-sixth year his daughter Nialimmidashu was established as mistress of Marhashi, another region along the mountains to the east.² The next year Ubara was restored, and in the one following preparation for war was made more efficient by taking over the Suti art of archery, when we are told that the "citizens of Ur were made bowmen."

Thus prepared, Dungi was ready for the series of raids which was initiated with the "destruction" of Ganhar in the thirty-fourth year, but so little was it a real destruction that the operation must be repeated in the forty-first and forty-third years. Not impossibly, it is to this period that we are to assign a king of that country by the name of Kisari, whose seal has come down to us.³ Simurru was ravaged in the thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth, and forty-second years, but when in the fifty-fourth it was again "destroyed," in company with Lulubu, this destruction was listed as the ninth! The connection with Lulubu is welcome, for it proves that Simurru was located well beyond the northeast frontier, but we may doubt the correctness of the numeral. More to the west, but still east of the Tigris and commanding the direct road from Babylonia to what was soon to be the Assyrian triangle, was Hurshitu, or, as the Babylonians were accustomed to say, Harshe, about this time ruled by a king named Puhia,

¹ Note especially the data in *SAK*, 229 ff.; Genouillac, *Trouvailles*, 12.

² For the equation Marhashi=Parashi, *II R.* 50, 66; 6; 16; cf. Jensen, *ZA*, XV, 230. For the name of the daughter, Myrhman, *Doc.*, 35.

³ *Coll. de Clercq*, No. 121; *SAK*, 174 f.

the son of Asiru, who had built a palace in true Babylonian fashion.¹ In this thirty-seventh year, and again in the last of his long reign, Harshe was ravaged, and a step was taken toward the control of what was to become the debatable ground in the early Assyrian times. To the southeast he was on good-enough terms with the patesi of Anshan in his fortieth year to give him his daughter, but it would seem that Lipum did not remain faithful, for but four years later Anshan was devastated. Shashru was destroyed in the fifty-second year. The fifty-fifth year was a year of great combinations, when Urbillu, perhaps the Assyrian sacred city of Arbela, Simurru, Lulubu, and Ganhar were all "destroyed" in one year.² In the one following Kimash and Humurti were plundered, and in the last of the reign Harshe, Kimash and Humurti are the places mentioned. The summary of these constantly repeated date formulas is dry enough, but it points to a period of almost constant warfare on the eastern frontier. Now and then the business documents give us something more, as when one of the records of the Drehem stockyards tells us of bulls sent to that place from the booty of Harshe.³

If we leave now the date formulas at the end of the records and study the business documents themselves, we add still more to our sources of information, for there are few periods of Babylonian history where the business records throw so much light on the political history. This is not the place to study in detail the elaborate organization of the state,⁴ but we may at least note the large number of places in Elam which are now under the rule of local patesis, for the very mention of them is impressive—Harishi, Huhnuri, Sabu, Ula, Urri, Zaula, Gisha, Siri, Siu, Nehune, Sigiresh, Az, Shabara, Shimash, Simashgi, Marhar, Adamdum.⁵ Some of these we know from outside sources; others are unimportant places which we find only here. Of patesis of Adamdum, better known by the native Elamite name of Hatamti,⁶ we know Ur Gigir and Nagidda. Ashnunnak has an

¹ Scheil, *RT*, XVI, 186; XIX, 64; *SAK*, 172 f. Found at Tûz Khurmâtî.

² Weidner, *OLZ*, XI, 392 f., has a date month 11, year before Urbillinum destroyed.

³ Genouillac, *Drehem*, pl. 8.

⁴ A study of all the documents of the period is under way. The University of Illinois Oriental Museum contains over five hundred tablets from Umma, nearly four hundred from Drehem, and a number of messenger tablets and sealings.

⁵ Thureau-Dangin, *CR Acad.*, 1902, 88 f.

⁶ So read for the usual Hapirti, Scheil, *Del*, X, 3.

independent king in the fifty-fourth year of Dungi and a patesi in the fifty-seventh, thus pointing to a change in the position of that locality.¹ Susa itself recognized, in the person of its patesis Ur Kium and Zarik, the rule of Dungi,² and far later times remembered his name in the "Fort of Dungi," Dur Dungi, in their territory.³ Far to the south in the open sea Tilmun was in his possession. Well might a poet of later days exclaim that "Ninib had given him a life of long days and years of plenty."⁴

Unusual interest centers in the reign of Dungi because it represents the culmination of the idea of deification of the reigning monarch. His name came to be written with the sign of deity prefixed. Servile courtiers named their children from him, identifying him with the god Babbar or the god Uru, or giving such names as Dungi ili, "the god Dungi is my god," or Dungi bani, "the god Dungi is my creator." His official inscriptions call him "god of his Land." To him was erected the temple E Dungi; the appointment of his chief priest dated a year, as did the installation of the priests of any of the great gods; a feast was established in his honor, and from it was named a new month, and offerings were presented at his shrine.⁵ In his honor men recited hymns blessing him as the Lord who made glad the land Kengi, who made songs of peace to be sung in the Lower Land, wailing in the Upper, who put down revolt. The god Dungi is the God King (Dingir Lugal), whose name excels every other name, whether the name of Enlil, of Enzu, or of Babbar.⁶ Truly Dungi was in great honor.

We of the present find it extremely difficult to understand the psychical environment in which king-worship can grow up. For its full fruition somewhat peculiar conditions are demanded. The reign of primitive spirits must be left behind, gods must be clear cut, a

¹ Dhorme, *RA*, IX, 41, on basis of Genouillac, *Drehem*, 11. For elaborate discussion of Ashnunak cf. Jensen, *ZA*, XV, 219 ff.

² Scheil, *RT*, XXII, 153.

³ Scheil, *Del*, X, 59.

⁴ Radau, *Hymns and Prayers to Ninib*, No. 1, iii, 34; cf. p. 51. Somewhere about this time are to be placed Bel iarik of Susa, Hunini of Kimash and governor of Madqa, Sayce, *ZA*, VI, 161; Hommel, *Bab. Or. Rec.*, VI, 157; *SAK*, 176 f. Mutilated legend of Dungi, *CT*, XIII, 45; cf. King, *Chron.*, I, 60, n. 2, for possible defeat of the king of Babylon.

⁵ For references cf. Mercer, *JAOS*, XXXVI, 367 ff.

⁶ Langdon, *Sum. Lit. Texts*, 136 ff. Cf. now Barton, *Miscel. Bab. Ins.* No. 3.

hierarchy developed, a king of the gods. The Shumerians from a very early time had possessed conceptions which gave promise of such development. City-state and god were identical. In the Shumerian writing Nippur is written En lil ki, "town of the god Enlil;" the chief god of Lagash is Nin Girsu, "lord of Girsu," one of the towns which combined to form the city-state; Nannar is called King of Ur, his wife Nin gal, Lady of Ur. One of the commonest phrases in the royal dedications is, "To such and such a god, my king." Since the local deity was the ruler of the state, nay, the very state itself, he was naturally conceived as owner as well as ruler of all that it possessed. In so many words we are told that the various states are the property of their respective deities. Not temples alone are erected for his divinity; city walls and new suburbs likewise increase his patrimony. Under these circumstances the patesi is but the deputy of the god, the chosen of the divinity, the beloved of his heart, whose name has been called by him. As yet there was little loss to the patesi in this dependence upon the god. The priesthood was not yet predominant, religion was still in large part a mere department of the state, and the patesi was the personal representative of the god. As such his welfare was identified with that of the deity himself and of the state under his rule, and rebellion against him was rebellion against the god. Since all things material belonged to the city god, by the same process of reasoning all things material belonged to his deputy. In this conception we have the ancestor and prototype of that manorial system, so wide-reaching and so potent in its effect, according to which the land is the personal property of the ruler, and its tillers pay him rent and not taxes.

Such then was the theory from which the conception of divine kingship originated. Strange as it may seem, there is no proof that this step was taken by the Shumerians. The first great Semitic dynasty, that of Agade, first to our knowledge placed the divine sign before their names and accepted such statements as "Naram Sin is the god of Agad."¹ The time came when human kings ruled over

¹ Langdon, *Sum. Lit. Texts*, 106 ff., believes that the conception was Shumerian in origin and that the Semites caused its abandonment. While undoubtedly developed from Shumerian conceptions, we have no certain or even probable case of divine kingship among Shumerians, save in this Ur dynasty. On the other hand, it first appears among the Semites of Agade, reaches its height under the West Semitic dynasty of Nisin, and

far more than what was included in the land once ruled by the supreme god Enlil. It was an easy step to believe that the mighty hero was at least the equal of the gods themselves. Political conditions doubtless added to the movement. Vassals may not themselves believe in the divinity of their rulers, but they are willing to use the expression for the sake of flattery. Kings might not be quite sure of their divinity, but it was a convenient tool which eased greatly the difficulties of government. And it is a truism that men come soon to belief in their own hocus-pocus. If men acted as though their rulers were gods, it was not long before they or their children were persuaded that there was something unusually divine in the hero who had conquered distant lands and had given them internal peace. The ruler likewise soon came to believe that had he not in him something of the divine above the average of the common herd he could not have been the hero he undoubtedly was. The origin of Babylonian god kings is no academic question, for from them descended in large part the theory of divine right which still is a menace today.¹

Like Dungi, his successors have left us practically no historical references in their formal inscriptions, and we must again go to the date formulas for such information as we secure. Dungi was followed

is little less among the members of the West Semitic First Dynasty of Babylon, where Hammurapi seems deliberately imitating Dungi. When we add the worship of Ashur and the king among the Assyrians, the custom is seen to be markedly and persistently Semitic.

¹ In a most able article, "Emperor Worship in Babylonia," *JAOs*, XXXVI. 360 ff., Mercer has attempted to prove that there was no such thing. In many of the cases he cites, taken individually, such an explanation is at least a possibility, but the culminating force is irresistible. Others, such as those cited in the text, can hardly be explained save on the assumption of the worship of the god king. Only such a theory will account for the sign of the divinity before such West Semitic sentences as *Idin Dagan* or *Ishme Dagan*, for we can no more postulate divinity for such verbal forms of obvious tense as *Idin* or *Ishme* than we can interpret *Nathaniel* or *Ishmael* as "Nathan is god," "Ishme is god." Mercer seems not to know the best proof of the divinity of the kings, the hymns, where, for example, the term "god king" is actually used. Note also the very striking text, Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, 26, where the various *Nisin* kings are actually identified with *Tammuz*. We are very fortunate in having the opportunity of studying king-worship, as a political institution and in the very blaze of full history, in the Hellenistic and imperial Roman periods. Recent students have devoted much attention to these phases, especially from the standpoint of political theory, and no study of the king god in the ancient Near East can afford to ignore these results. The development, for example, of the hard-headed young Alexander into a self-persuaded divinity illuminates almost every phase of our own problem. The chapter on "Alexander and World Monarchy" in W. S. Ferguson's *Greek Imperialism*, 116 ff., and the bibliography there cited, will furnish an introduction to the problem of the god king in the Graeco-Roman world.

by his son Bur Sin with a reign of but nine years (2404–2395 B.C.).¹ We have a hint of troubles at his succession, for the tummal of Ninlil at Nippur, restored by Ur Engur and Dungi, was again destroyed before the end of Bur Sin's reign.² Of warlike events the date formulas tell us but little—of conquests of Urbillu in the second year, of Shashru and Shuruthum in the sixth, and of Huhnuri, Harshe,³ and Iapru in the seventh. These do not tell the whole story, for in the fourth year we find booty from Shashru and Shuruthum sent to the Drehem cattle pens.⁴

More rapid even than under Dungi are the changes in the patesis. Taking Lagash as the best known, we find Ur Lama still there in the third year, Nanni zi shaggal the year following, Sharakam in the next, Arad Mu in the eighth, and Arad Nannar in the ninth.⁵ Better proof that the patesiat has sunk to a mere governorship could not be found. Of the mass of other patesis we note but one, Zariku, the shakkannak of Ashir, who made a dedication in the temple of the god Nin ekallin for the life of his lord Bur Sin, the mighty king of Ur and the king of the Four World Regions, for this gives us our first synchronism between Assyria and Babylonia.⁶

More important than this change of patesis, more important perhaps than even the changing names of the later rulers, is the appearance of Arad Nannar, the power behind the throne. This powerful individual came from a line of strong ministers, for his grandfather, Lani, and his father, Ur Shulpae, had before him held the position of sukkal mah, or first minister, the highest a subject could hope for under the dynasty.⁷ He himself became sukkal mah in the

¹ Inscriptions, I R. 3, xii, 5, xix; *CT*, III, 1; *XXI*, 24; *OBI*, 20 ff.; Peters, *Nippur*, II, op. p. 374; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 40; Menant, *TSBA*, I, 40; Lenormant, *TSBA*, I, 40; Winckler, *KB*, 88 f.; Radau, *Hist.*, 231 ff.; Oppert, *Exped.*, I, 269; Scheil, *RT*, XIX, 49; Dhorme, *ZA*, XIX, 394 ff.; seal of his son Ur Bau, *ibid.*, XX, 67 f.; *XXII*, 38; *MDOG*, XVII, 15; King, *Sumer*, op. p. 310; *SAK*, 196 ff.; *VS*, I, 26; Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 26; cf. Sachau, *ZA*, X, 84 ff., 268 ff. Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, 17, still thinks Amar Sin the preferable reading, but note Bur Sin in Radau, *Hymns*, 43, and cf. photograph.

² Poebel, *Texts*, No. 7.

³ Harshe equals Hal risha, of the Elamite, which equals the Semitic Bitum Rabium, which in turn represents the later Ekallate, Scheil, *RT*, XXXVII, 135 ff.

⁴ Genouillac, *Drehem*, pl. 35.

⁵ Dhorme, *RA*, 49; Genouillac, *Drehem*, pl. 3; *OBI*, 126; *RTC*, 298.

⁶ Andrä, *MDOG*, LIV, 16.

⁷ Genouillac, *Drehem*, 15, 18; *RTC*, 429; *RA*, III, 124; *SAK*, 202 f.; Janneau, *Dynastie chald.*, 54 ff.

forty-fifth year of Dungi and held the position until the third year of Ibe Sin, the second successor of Bur Sin. Under Gimil Sin, the next successor, we find him not only sukkal mah but patesi of Lagash, Sabum, Gutebum, Al Gimil Sin, Hansi, Ganhar, and gir nita, or shakkannak, of Timat Bel, Urbillu, Tilmun, Lu, and Karada. This was indeed a princely kingdom, stretching from Arbela on the extreme northeast, through the Elamite states on the eastern mountain boundary, to the age-old Lagash, and to Tilmun, far in the Persian Gulf.¹

Figurehead though he seems to have been, and short though his reign, Bur Sin was long remembered. Perhaps it was the policy of Arad Nannar, as it was of so many of his successors, to isolate the nominal ruler the more effectually from participation in the government by making him the more divine and therefore the more inaccessible. Bur Sin like his father had the sign of the divinity placed before his name; he called himself "the righteous god of his Land," "the righteous god, the sun of his Land," and his servants spoke him as their "beloved god."² He is identified with the star of Marduk.³ To him were directed hymns of praise.⁴ In Assyrian times his name occurs in a list of gods⁵ as one of the minor deities in the train of the moon-god.

In the last year of his reign he associated with himself his son Gimil Sin,⁶ of whose nine years (2395-2386 B.C.) we know next to nothing.⁷ Susa was still under his control, as is shown by one of his brick inscriptions.⁸ Expeditions still took place, one in the first year against Kishurra, where perhaps ruled as patesi Iam Shamash, son of Idin ilu,⁹ one against Simanu in the third, and another against

¹ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VI, 67 ff.; a duplicate of *RA*, V, 99; Janneau, *Dynastie chald.*, 56, n. 2.

² Cf. Mercer, *JAOS*, XXXVI, 369.

³ Scheil, *ZA*, XII, 265.

⁴ Radau, *Hymns*, No. 1.

⁵ Even Mercer, *JAOS*, XXXVI, 376 f., admits that this is a case of deification.

⁶ Poebel, *OLZ*, XVII, 241 ff.

⁷ Thus the date lists, seven according to the Hilprecht list. Inscriptions I R. 3, xi; IV R. 35, 4; *CT*, XXI, 28; Scheil, *RT*, XXVI, 22; Peters, *Nippur*, op. p. 238; Radau, *Hist.*, 277; Clay, *Light*, 198; Oppert, *RA*, V, 57 f.; [Menant, *Glyptique*, 132;] *SAK*, 200 ff.; Banks, *Bismya*, 114; Janneau, *Dynastie chald.*, 49 ff.; *VS*, I, 27.

⁸ *Del*, X, 12.

⁹ Brick, Koldewey—Messerschmidt, *MDOG*, XV, 13 f.

Zabshali in the seventh. Marriages now played a large part in holding the patesis, and we hear of the marriage of the patesi of Zabshali with the daughter of the Babylonian king Tukin hattimigrisha, and of supplies which the daughter of the king took into Anshan in the second year, evidently on her marriage to the ruler of that country.¹ Matters might go well enough on the eastern border, but the west was the line of danger, and there is a most significant silence as to the expeditions which must have been directed to this frontier. As early as his fourth year we find Gimil Sin erecting the "Wall of Martu," the Muriq Tidnim by name, and restoring the Gir Martu, the "West Street" named Madane.² When we further read that "he turned back the host of Amurru into their land,"³ we clearly enough understand why all these protective measures must be taken against the people of the middle Euphrates, and we begin to suspect that it will not be long before these same Amorites are to subjugate the land.

The last king of the dynasty was Ibe Sin, the son of Gimil Sin. His accession year occurs with the wonted frequency on the business documents; his second, devoted to the installation of a priest, occurs in a single one; another speaks of the destruction of Simuru, and then the supply of tablets ceases. A few minor inscriptions preserved his name, but no record on the scale even of the other kings of the dynasty has come down to us from his twenty-five-year reign (2386–2361 B.C.).⁴ The significance of this sudden change cannot be mistaken. At the accession of Ibe Sin conditions were normal and business was as usual. In the following years all this was changed.

We may conjecture one of the causes. Bur Sin was undoubtedly not young when he ascended the throne, but his short reign would have brought Gimil Sin into power at a younger age. With the close of his short reign his son Ibe Sin must have been a mere infant, powerless in the hands of Arad Nannar. Things were doubtless in a bad way, and yet in internal affairs alone we cannot see the reason for the

¹ Virolleaud, *ZA*, XIX, 384 f.

² Unger, *ZA*, XXIX, 179 ff.; Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 20.

³ *CT*, XXXII, 6; Förtsch, *OLZ*, XVII, 57.

⁴ Smith, *TSBA*, I, 41; Hilprecht, *ZA*, VIII, 343 ff.; Radau, *Hist.*, 241; *RTC*, 431; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, III, 126; *SAK*, 202 f.; Ledrain, *RA*, VII, 49 f.; Ward, *AJSL*, XIX, 149 f.; Janneau, *Dynastie chald.*, 58 ff.; Barton, *Miscel. Bab. Ins.*, No. 7.

fall of the dynasty. It was unfortunate for Babylonia that the rulers weakened just at the time when two young, vigorous states were attacking it on either side. On the one frontier was Elam, freed by that time from Babylonian overlordship.¹ On the other was the kingdom which had been forming on the middle Euphrates, with its capital at the old center of Mari. At first the inhabitants seem to have been of the same race as the remainder of our land, but by this time the Euphrates had been conquered by the West Semites, and it was one of these Semites, Ishbi urra, the "man of Mari," who "subdued the lord of Ur, the hostile man," "seized Amurru from its mountain, and overthrew Elam, the strong land."²

While Ishbi urra was invading Babylonia from the northwest the Elamites were playing their part. At this time, so we may conjecture, the Elamite monarch Kudur nanhundi carried off from Uruk that image of the goddess Nanna whose capture Ashur bani apal, the last great Assyrian king, places 1,635 years before his time, so that it would have taken place, according to the scribe, about 2270 B.C., almost a century out of the way.³ To this period then we are to attribute the lament sung by her priests, a lament preserved to us in an Assyrian translation as well as in the original Shumerian, which tells how the enemy came into the house of the goddess, laid his unwashed hands upon her, made her tread the deck of the ship, and caused her to fear, clothed his wife with her garments and his daughter with her jewels, so that they caused her to fly from her house like a bird, and made her to say, "I shall be there no more."⁴

Ibe Sin too was carried off to Mari, and a hymn which was sung in Nippur laments the fall of Ur, the capture of the king, and the fact that "in the land the dark-headed people with swords were slaughtered."⁵ Ishbi urra secured the fruits of victory and established the dynasty which we usually call that of Nisin. Of

¹ King, *Suppl.*, 2833; Omen Ibi Sin sha Elamtu, which King makes a conquest of Elam by Ibe Sin; cf. also Omen 16634, *Suppl.*, 3166.

² Barton, *Miscel. Bab. Ins.*, No. 9; cf. Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 136; Langdon, *Babyloniaca*, VII, 39.

³ Ashur bani apal, *Ann.*, VI, 107 ff.; so King, *Sumer*, 304 f.

⁴ *CT*, XV, 24 f.; Langdon, *Psalms*, 1 ff.; Prince, *JAOS*, XXXI, 395 ff.; Assyrian paraphrase, Pinches, *PSBA*, XVII, 64 ff.

⁵ Langdon, *Babyloniaca*, VII, 39.

the various rulers we know the name and length of reign and but little more.¹ From the scanty data it is clear that they are inferior to their predecessors in extent of territory; at least the eastern border is now independent, but there are many hints that these West Semites anticipated in many ways their brethren of the First Dynasty of Babylon, and that some day we shall find their period of much importance in the internal development. Ishbi urra reigned thirty years (2361–2329 B.C.), and, according to a late authority, had no rivals.² Of his son, Gimil ilishu, we know only that he ruled ten years and was then succeeded in turn by his son, Idin Dagan (2319–2298 B.C.), who held territory at least as far north as Sippar.³ Idin Dagan stands out in our minds with sudden vividness, for one contemporary record identifies him in so many words with the dying god Tammuz, and another celebrates his mystical marriage with the mother-goddess Innanna.⁴ It may be merely accident that we have documents of this type from the Nisin dynasty, it may be that we here dimly behold one of the religious transformations due to the coming of the West Semites.

Ishme Dagan is probably the best-known ruler of the dynasty. His titulary is, "Who cares for Nippur, protector of Ur, urdadu of Eridu, lord of Uruk, the mighty king, king of Nisin, king of Shumer and Akkad." Thus Nippur still holds its pre-eminent position, and even conquered Ur ranks high above Nisin. Worthy of note is the absence of North Babylonian titles.⁵ A hymn in his honor calls him the son of the god Dagan, the peculiar deity of the West Semites, and tells of his victories, while the ruler himself asks that the god Babbar, the sun-god, may place justice and righteousness in his mouth.⁶ Another makes him the son rather of Enlil. Bau, the goddess of healing, has granted the king length of days—we are evidently near

¹ Hilprecht list.

² Boissier, *Doc. rel. à la Divin.*, I, 30; Meissner, *OLZ*, X, 114, inscription IV R². 35, vii. Nippur was under his control. Poebel, *Texts*, No. 7.

³ Scheil, *RT*, XVI, 187 f.; Radau, *Hist.*, 232 f.

⁴ Radau, *Hilprecht Vol.*, 391 ff.; Zimmern, *Alte Orient*, XIII, 1, 16; Langdon, *Grammar*, 196 ff.; *Tammuz*, 27.

⁵ I R. 2, v, 1 f.; *OBI*, No. 17; I, 27; *CT*, XXI, 20 f.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 38; Menant, *Ann.*, 17; *Bab. Chald.*, 78; Lenormant, *Etud.*, II, 332; Hommel, *Semiten*, I, 231; Winckler, *KB*, III, 86 f.; *SAK*, 206 f.; King, *Sumer*, op. p. 310; *VS*, I, 29, from Ur.

⁶ Langdon, *Sum. Lit. Texts*, 143 ff.

the end of his twenty years of rule—Enlil decreed to him his fate. So the gods are besought to secure for him abundance from the Tigris and Euphrates, drink and food from their banks, honey from the gardens, grain from the fields, cattle from the stalls, and sheep from the folds, that the royal power may be made famous, that the princely right may be exalted above heaven, and that the Euphrates may go like the sunshine unto the Tigris.¹ So Enlil decreed that Ishme Dagan should have a mighty scepter in Ekur in Nippur, should have no rival, should enter into the vast dwelling, the famed abode of royalty, and should take his seat in the chapel of gold and lapis lazuli.²

After a reign of twenty years (2298–2278 B.C.) Ishme Dagan was succeeded by his brother Libit Ishtar, who ruled eleven years (2278–2267 B.C.) and made the same claims as to extent of territory as had his brother.³ With him ends the dynasty proper, for his son Aranzunikuduba, “the righteous light of Shumer of Akkad,” for whom his father erected the “House of Vessels” in Ur,⁴ never reigned, and his place was taken by Ur Ninib (2267–2239 B.C.), whose descent from a certain Ishkur . . . proves him a usurper.⁵

Of the later kings of this Nisin dynasty still less of interest is to be recorded, and we have no reason to assume that anything of value has here been lost. Ur Ninib ruled from Ur and Eridu to Nippur and Nisin, with the title “King of Shumer and Akkad,” and claimed the conquest of Zabshali and of the Su peoples, the wild nomads of the steppe.⁶ His son Bur Sin II (2239–2218 B.C.) is known only as the builder of the wall Migir Ninsina,⁷ and of Iter

¹ This obviously refers to the fact that the water taken by the canals from the Euphrates generally flows into the Tigris.

² Langdon, *Sum. Lit. Texts*, 178 ff.; cf. Zimmern, *Kultlieder*, No. 200.

³ I R. 5, xviii; *CT*, XXI, 18 f.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 37; Menant, *Bab. Chald., l.c.*; Lenormant, *Etud.*, 330, 380; Winckler, *l.c.*; *SAK*, 204 f. For Lipit Ishtar and Amurru, *CT*, IV, 22; cf. Ranke, *OLZ*, X, 112 ff.; Meissner, *OLZ*, X, 114 ff.; Lindl, *OLZ*, X, 387 ff. We should follow the list of Poebel, *Texts*, No. 2, rather than No. 5, and the Hilprecht list, which makes him the son of his predecessor, as this is the likely error. Legend of Libit Ishtar, *CT*, XIII, 45, mutilated.

⁴ Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 27.

⁵ Dates, Hilprecht, *OLZ*, X, 386; *Bab. Exped.*, Ser. D, I, 381, n. 4; V, I, 38; Peters, *Nippur*, II, op. p. 374; Langdon, *Tammuz*, 26.

⁶ IV R², 35, 5; *OBI*, No. 18; I, 27; *SAK*, 204 f.; Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 138; *VS*, I, 28.

⁷ *OBI*, No. 19; I, 27; Hilprecht, *Math. Texts*, 49; *Bab. Exped.*, Ser. D, I, 38; Chiera, *Doc.*, 68 f. Poebel, *Texts*, No. 2, places *bal*, “dynasty,” after Ur Ninib, though Bur Sin is his son and Iterpisha and Ur-ra imiti his grandsons.

pisha we know only his date (2218–2213 B.C.). Urra imiti, the brother of Iter pisha (2213–2206 B.C.), claims for one year that he “established righteousness,” and for another that he “restored Nippur to its place,” statements which may point to some successes in a declining kingdom.¹ According to the Sargon Chronicle, Urra imiti the king placed Enlil bani the gardener on the throne that the dynasty might not end; the crown of his royalty on his head he placed. Urra imiti in his palace died. Enlil bani who sat on his throne did not arise; in the kingship he was established.² The lists, however, show us that this is not strictly correct. Before Enlil bani could reign a usurper held the throne for six months.³ Of the twenty-four years of Enlil bani we know only that it was said that he “disclosed the light to all the land and the people of the sons of Nisin.”⁴ Zambia ruled three years (2182–2179 B.C.), his successor five, and Urdu azagga four.⁵ Sin magir (2174–2170 B.C.) again uses the title “King of Shumer and Akkad.”⁶ The long, twenty-three-year rule of Damiq ilishu (2159–2136 B.C.) was marked only by the rebuilding of the wall of Nisin. He still boasts himself “King of Shumer and Akkad,” but this did not save him. Nisin fell, and the uninteresting dynasty came to an end.⁷

At the same time that the dynasty of Dungi gave way in the north to the rulers of Nisin a new dynasty appeared in the south with its headquarters at Larsa.⁸ The first four rulers, Naplanum with twenty-one years (2358–2337 B.C.), Emisu with twenty-eight

¹ Dates, Chiera, *Doc.*, 69; Hilprecht, *Bab. Exped.*, Ser. D, V, 1, 38; ZA, XXI, 20 ff. Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 139, notes that Urra imiti is not the son of his predecessor and suggests that the destruction of Nippur took place at his accession. He seems actually to have been a brother.

² Chron., II, 15 f. The phrase “that the dynasty might not end” is not certain. Hrozný, *WZKM*, XXI, 381, reads *ana salam pûhi ina kussishu usheshib*, “als ‘Abbild des Stellenvertreters’ auf seinem Thron.”

³ Sin(?) . . . ; cf. Clay, *Ins.*, 33, for discussion.

⁴ Nail, Hogg, *Jour. Manchester Or. Soc.*, 1911, 1 ff.; tablets, Scheil, *RT*, XIX, 59; Hussey, *JAOS*, XXXVI, 34 ff.; Chiera, *Doc.*, No. 9.

⁵ So Chiera, *Doc.*, 70.

⁶ Weissbach, *Bab. Miscel.*, No. 1.

⁷ Chiera, *Doc.*, 71; Scheil, *RT*, XXIII, 93 f.; Sippar, 140; Hilprecht, *Math. Texts*, No. 1; 49 f.; Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, No. 73.

⁸ According to the dates of the Clay list, cf. tables in Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, 41, it was three years later. This difference is probably due to error in computing part years, though it may be argued that the Dungi dynasty lasted three years longer in the south than in the north.

(2337–2309 B.C.), Samum with thirty-five (2309–2274 B.C.), and Zabaia with nine (2274–2265 B.C.), had a combined rule of almost a century. So long a sway points to a period of marked importance, but as matters stand at present we must base our conjecture only on the names and the length of stay on the throne. The first of whom we can speak with any assurance is Gungunum (2265–2238 B.C.), who calls himself “King of Larsa, King of Shumer and Akkad.”¹ The latter title claims north as well as south, and it can hardly be a coincidence that the man who used it came to the throne but two years after the end of the original Nisin dynasty in the north. At least one refugee fled for safety to the south, Eannatum, son of Ishme Dagan, and so brother of the last ruler, Libit Ishtar. He found at the hands of Gungunum a good reception and was made “Lord” or high priest of Nannar at Ur, where he was permitted to erect in his own name a temple in honor of Babbar, the sun-god, and of his suzerain, Gungunum. Especially noteworthy is it that in this inscription Gungunum is given only the title “King of Ur,” whereas Eannatum boasts his descent from a father who was “King of Shumer and Akkad.” The nearest conjecture is that it was not until this potential pretender was out of the way that Gungunum himself added the Shumer and Akkad title.² If we may be permitted once more to conjecture, we may surmise that his attempt to conquer the north resulted in his death in battle, for thus we best explain the date formula which speaks of the “year in which Gungunum died.”³

Thus far the names have had a very un-Semitic look. With Abi sare, whose reign of eleven years (2238–2227 B.C.) brought him as far north as Kish,⁴ we have at least Semitization, if not a change in race. After Sumu ilu, whose only title to fame is an inscription on a clay dog⁵ and a rule of twenty-nine years (2227–2198 B.C.), we have a period of shorter reigns. Nur Immer or Immerum (2198–2182 B.C.), who reigned sixteen years, appears in an oath formula before Sumu

¹ *SAK*, 206 f.

² Cone, *I R.* 2, vi, 1; *CT*, XXI, 22; Dhorme, *ZA*, XIX, 391 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 38; Menant, *Bab. Chald.*, 79; Lenormant, *Etud.*, II, 334; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 39; *KB*, 86 f.; Radau, *Hist.*, 25; *SAK*, 206 f.

³ Scheil, *RT*, XXI, 125; *SAK*, 236; King, *Sumer*, 311, n. 4.

⁴ Scheil, *RT*, XXXIV, 109; *CT*, XXXIII, 50; Johns, *PSBA*, XXXII, 274.

⁵ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VI, 36, 69 ff.; *SAK*, 208 f.; Zuma ilu in oath.

la ilu, the second king of the First Babylonian Dynasty, and thus proves, what the conquest of Kish might have led us to suspect, that the earliest kings of this dynasty were subject to Larsa.¹ To him succeeded his son Sin idinnam (2182–2175 B.C.), who again claims kingship over Shumer and Akkad. He calls himself king of Ga esh, thus indicating that city as the home of the dynasty, and informs us that he smote the foe in its entirety.² Who the foe was he does not tell, but there can be little doubt that it was the Elamite. At any rate Sin idinnam was on the throne but seven years, his successor Sin iribam but two,³ Sin iqisham six,⁴ and Silli Immer but one.

The small number of regnal years recorded indicates clearly enough that we are dealing with a period of uncertainty and disorder, brought to an end by the accession of an Elamite with the very Semitic name of Warad Sin. His father, Kudur Mabuk, the son of Simti shilhak, was still living, and it is certain that he was the actual conqueror of Babylonia, his son being a mere vassal, however he may have differed from the earlier patesis in holding the title of king. Kudur Mabuk scorned the royal name and contented himself with the title of Adda or of its Semitic equivalent "Father," a title we may with some accuracy translate as "Emperor." Sometimes he is Adda of Emutbal, the region along the border between Elam and Babylonia.⁵ After the conquest of the middle Euphrates country he changed this to Adda of Amurru, the "Westland."⁶ For the moment he seems to have ruled Babylonia in his own person, for we have a

¹ Cone, I R. 2, iv; *CT*, XXI, 29; *SAK*, 208 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 45; Menant, *op. cit.*, 89; Radau, *Hist.*, 286; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 38; *KB*, 90; date formula, Schorr, *Urkunden*, 611; the oath, *CT*, IV; cf. Ranke, *Names*, 43. Note that the chronology of King is proved wrong, since his date for Nur Immer, 2175–2160 B.C., does not coincide with the certainly dated Sumu la ilu in 2211–2175 B.C.

² I R. 3, 9; 5, 20; IV R. 36, 2; *CT*, XXI, 30; Delitzsch, *BA*, I, 301 ff.; Lenormant, *Choix*, No. 6; *Etud.*, 337 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 44 ff.; Menant, *op. cit.*, 88; Winckler, *KB*, 90 ff.; *SAK*, 208 ff.

³ Date, Scheil, *RT*, XXIV, 24; *OLZ*, VIII, 350 ff.; XVII, 246, a building at Adab; weight, Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 30.

⁴ Nippur date formula. What we should do with the king Iluni or Iluli of the date Scheil, *OLZ*, XVII, 246, I do not know.

⁵ Canephorus of Rim Sin, A–B, Lenormant, *Choix*, No. 70; *Etud.*, II, 343; Winckler, *KB*, 98; Price, *Rim Sin*, 7; *MDOG*, V, 17 ff.; *SAK*, 218 ff.; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, XI, 91 ff.; *VS*, I, 30 f.

⁶ Brick A of Warad Sin, I R. 2, 3; *CT*, XXI, 33; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 43; Menant, *op. cit.*, 86; Lenormant, *Etud.*, 346 ff.; Winckler, *KB*, 92; Price, *Rim Sin*, 6; Rogers, *Parallels*, 247 f.; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, IX, 121 ff.; *RT*, XXXII, 44; Toffteen, *Chron.*, 98.

stele in which he insists in good Babylonian that he "never did ill to Larsa or Emutbal."¹ Still this can have lasted but a short time, for Kudur Mabuk was never entered in the list of the Larsa kings, and we soon find him, in company with his son Warad Sin as king of Larsa, telling of his revenge on Ebarra and of his breaking in pieces armies of Kazallu and of Mutiaballa in Larsa and in Emutbal.² All this might indicate an invasion of Babylonia from the north and east, but another explanation is possible. Perhaps he is merely remembering the attacks made from this direction on the last two kings of the preceding dynasty, and considers himself the avenger of Sin idinnam, for we have his son Rim Sin worshiping that ruler, an honor given to no other of the dynasty.³

Warad Sin reigned twelve years (2166–2154 B.C.), first as king of Larsa,⁴ and then, when his domain was extended more to the north, as king of Shumer and Akkad, ruling such states as Eridu, Nippur, Lagash, and Hallab.⁵ The great wall of Ur was rebuilt,⁶ and the city of Sagkabdu was restored to its place.⁷ One year he showed his filial piety by erecting a golden statue of his father in the Shamash temple of Larsa.⁸ He died before his father and was succeeded by his brother Rim Sin, who has gained an unearned notoriety through the common identification with the Arioch of Ellasar, whom the fourteenth chapter of Genesis makes a contemporary of the patriarch Abraham.⁹ As his brother seems to have died without issue, and as Rim Sin enjoyed the extraordinarily long reign of sixty-one years, it

¹ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, XI, 91 ff. This dates from before the conquest of Amurru, as he is still called Adda of Emutbal.

² Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, IX, 121 ff.

³ Date formula, Langdon, *Babyloniaca*, VII, 46.

⁴ Brick A, Cyl., Winckler, [*Mith. d. Ak. Or. Ver.*, I, 16, 2;] *KB*, 94 f.; Price, *Rim Sin*, 16; *SAK*, 214 f.; Canephorus, Evetts, *PSBA*, XIII, 156 ff.; *CT*, XXI, 31; Price, *Rim Sin*, 11; *SAK*, 214 ff.

⁵ Brick B, I R. 5, 16; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 43, 386; Menant, *op. cit.*, 87; Lenormant, *Etud.*, 348 ff., 380; Winckler, *KB*, 94 f.; Price, *Rim Sin*, 8; *SAK*, 212 f.; Rogers, *Parallels*, 248. Stone tablet, *CT*, I, 45 f.; Price, *Rim Sin*, 12; *SAK*, 214 f.; *OBI*, 128. Cone, Lenormant, *Choix*, No. 67; IV R. 35, 6; Smith, *TSBA*, 43; Menant, *op. cit.*, 87; *KB*, 96; Price, *Rim Sin*, 10; *SAK*, 219 f.

⁶ Chiera, *Doc.*, No. 27; Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 31; Rogers, *Hist.*, II, op. p. 68.

⁷ Chiera, *Doc.*, No. 26.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 25; cf. Pilster, *PSBA*, XXXIII, 204 ff., for the reign.

⁹ Cf. especially Dhorme, *Rev. biblique*, 1908, 209; Pilster, *PSBA*, XXXIV, 6 ff., 41 ff.; Price, *Literary Remains of Rim Sin*; Thureau-Dangin, *JA*, X Ser., XIV, 335 ff.; Lindl, *BA*, IV, 382 ff.; letters of Rim Sin, Langdon, *PSBA*, XXXIII, 221 ff.; Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXXII, 98 ff.

would appear that both were mere children when they were given the throne. For a time Rim Sin was under the tutelage of his father.¹ After his death the young king erected in the Shamash temple "two beautiful bronze statues" of his father and himself, placed the sign for god before his own name,² and began a career of conquest which included the capture of Uruk,³ of great Dumun, of Kisurra, and the devastation of Der, thus opening the way for direct connection between Elam and North Babylonia. The date formulas show us Shesh in his possession, Zarbilum given a wall, while in Kesh the goddess Nin mah exalted him to the kingship over all the country.⁴ They also throw an interesting light on his canal operations. The Tigris, for example, was excavated as far as the sea, indicating how far north was its mouth at this period.

All other operations sink into obscurity when compared with the one great event of the reign, the capture of Nisin, where Damiq ilishu ruled as the last of his dynasty. It was now the eighteenth year of Rim Sin's reign,⁵ and so important did the event appear in the minds of his contemporaries that for thirty-one years thereafter men dated by the "year after the capture of Nisin."⁶

When we consider the importance of Babylon in later history and story and remember how it finally gave its name to the land itself, it is a matter of no little surprise that we have so few references to it in the period of the Shumerian domination. At the most there

¹ Canephorî A-B.

² Cf. Piltter, *PSBA*, XXXIV, 8. Thureau-Dangin, *JA*, X Ser., XIV, 338, argues that the absence of the god sign in five formulas shows that he reigned at least five years before taking the throne, but in three of these Rim Sin is not named. Thus we can prove but two years before the use of the sign for god.

³ Cone A, *Dec*, 41; Price, *Rim Sin*, 14; *SAK*, 216 f. Stone tablet A, I R. 3, 10; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 53; Menant, *op. cit.*, 90; Lenormant, *Etud.*, 351; *KB*, 94 f.; Price, *Rim Sin*, 9; *SAK*, 218 f.

⁴ Chiera, *Doc.*, 81; cf. Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 28, n. 1.

⁵ Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, 38; cf. Poebel, *ZA*, XX, 229 ff. It may be the seventeenth, as both years 18 and 19 are equated with year 2.

⁶ See dates collected by Chiera, *Doc.*, 74. The Oriental Museum of the University of Illinois has four hundred Larsa tablets. Possibly somewhere about this time we may place Haladda, patesi of Shuruppak, son of Dada, who held the same office, *MDOG*, XVI, 13 f.; *SAK*, 150 f. In this period also belongs Dada, patesi of Nippur, Lehmann, *BA*, II, 595; *SAK*, 160 f. A little earlier perhaps is the unknown ruler of Der, Scheil, *Del*, IV, 3; *SAK*, 174 f., and after him is Anu mutabil, the shakkannak of that city, who claims victories over Anshan, Elam, Simash, and Barahsu, Lenormant, *Choix*, No. 7, 5; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, 156, 7; *CT*, XXI, 1; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, IV, 42, n. 4; *SAK*, 176 f.; Radau, *Hist.*, 255, n. 12; Scheil, *Del*, II, 75 f.

are two or three chance remarks as to the temple Esagila, while the city god Marduk is virtually unknown. The rise of the ground water has destroyed most of the débris collected in this early period, but the rareness of material remains is no doubt in large part due to the fact that there was nothing to find. Hints of a prehistoric period are not unknown, the common paleolithic saws of obsidian or flint, the blanks from which they were fashioned, a single arrowhead from the neolithic period, crude stone mills and the stones by which the grain was rubbed into coarse meal, and schist vases with incised lines imitating matwork are proofs of an extremely early occupation of the later residential section.¹ Like many another ancient capital, Babylon seems to have been formed by the incorporation of several villages which were originally distinct. Another such settlement seems to have existed at the temple Esagila, and there was likewise one on the mound which later formed the southern citadel or acropolis, for Nebuchadnezzar calls it the Babil place. Cramped as this latter site seems to us today, it is much larger than the typical Mycenaean site of the Aegean area.²

Not until the days of the First Babylonian Dynasty do the material remains follow the inscriptional records in making Babylon a city of importance. The new part it was to play in history was due entirely to its conquest by a group of invading Semites, whose very names point to the west and thus prove them foreigners.³ Connection is most probable with the well-known West Semitic center of Mari, whence had already come the conquerors of the Nisin dynasty, and where at this very time were rulers with identical names.⁴

The earliest rulers of the new dynasty were unimportant enough. Of the founder, Sumu abum (2225-2211 B.C.), we hear first in connection with the building of the great wall of the city, perhaps the first of any strength Babylon ever possessed. This done, he began

¹ Koldewey, *Babylon*, 259 ff.

² *Ibid.*, 86 ff.

³ First argued by Pognon, *J.A.*, VIII Ser., XI, 544 ff.

⁴ Schnabel, *OLZ*, XIV, 19 ff., is undoubtedly correct in accepting the reading of the Armenian translation of Eusebius, which ultimately goes back to Berossus, Mar, in place of the usual Medes. Identification is to be made with Mari and not, save indirectly, with Amurru-Martu.

to extend his territory. In his third year he had already walled Kibalbarru¹ and in the ninth Dilbat. Thus he established his sway at least seventeen miles south of his capital city. To the north we may assume a greater extent of territory, for we are told, albeit in a somewhat late source, that Ilu shuma, king of Assyria, marched against him.² In the treatment of the conquered territory we find traces of two different systems. Dilbat was at once incorporated within the growing empire, perhaps because it had never known independence. Sippar, on the other hand, was permitted autonomy under its own kings and was even allowed to use its own date formulas. The only public sign of submission seems to have been in the courts, where the oath must henceforth be taken in the name of Sumu abum as well as in that of the sun-god, the patron deity of Sippar. No wonder Naram Sin remained the faithful vassal of Babylon.³

Advance to the east was more difficult, for here Sumu abum found a strenuous enemy in Ashduni erim of Kish, whose citadel could be seen from the turrets of Babylon. We may even conjecture that Kish had been mistress of Babylon when the West Semites arrived, for Ashduni erim declares that the Four World Regions revolted against him, when it is perfectly clear that he is referring to his war with Babylon. For eight years the conflict was waged, until he had but three hundred fighting men left. Then his gods, Zababa and Ishtar, came to his aid with food, and he was able to advance a day's journey and to lay waste his enemy's country. And then, just as we are expecting further details, he suddenly breaks off and tells us that he built the walls of Kish.⁴ The solution appears when we observe that by his tenth year Sumu abum is the admitted suzerain of Kish and as such dates his year by the making of a crown for the god Anu. Clearly Ashduni erim is telling of his war with Babylon and does not dare mention her by name. With Kish under his sway, Sumu

¹ Also in Hammurapi, Code, 17; the identification with Ki Babbar, Dhorme, *OLZ*, XI, 33; Poebel, *Hist. Texts*, 162, n. 2, cannot be accepted; cf. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXXIII, 300, n. 5.

² Chron. K. I, II, 14; King, *Babylon*, 141, makes this precede his first year in Babylon. Note that Sumu abum is not called king of Babylon.

³ VS, VIII, 3; cf. the local date, 1 f.

⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VIII; cf. King, *Babylon*, 143 f.

abum made no effort to attack the cities stretching down the Euphrates but continued eastward toward the Elamite border, where he raided the city of Kazallu, not far from the first mountain slopes. That this control was effective is shown by an Elamitish business document dated in the "year of Shumu abi."¹

After a reign of fourteen years Sumu abum was succeeded by Sumu la ilu, who, so far as we know, was in no manner related to him, and who is spoken of by later kings as if he were the founder of the dynasty. The first dozen of his thirty-six years (2211-2175 B.C.) were peaceful enough, devoted as they were to religious deeds, to building temples and digging canals, to "establishing righteousness," by which we are to understand the promulgation of a new code of laws. Only in the third year was this broken, when Halambu was ravaged, to be connected, we may be sure, with the capture of the South Babylonian city of Uruk under its king Iawium.² In the thirteenth year Kish revolted. Since the time of Ashdunir there had been a succession of rulers. Manana had reigned at least five years, beginning with the thirteenth of Sumu abum. After him came Sumu ditana, whose West Semitic name may indicate that he was a governor chosen from the ruling class and sent direct from Babylon. Iawium in the fifth year began a rule of at least five years, and Halium was on the throne for two. Then came the revolt, and Sumu la ilu took advantage of this fact to bring the independence of Kish to an end. The city-state was therefore incorporated directly in the empire, and so important was this deemed that for the five years following the date formulas referred to its capture.³ In the eighteenth year we find the Semite Iahzir ilum in Kazallu, and though we are told that he was driven out in this very same year it was not

¹ *Del*, X, 18. For the political history of the reign, as well as for those of his successors, we are almost entirely dependent on the casual references in the date formulas. These are most fully collected by Schorr, *Urkunden*, *passim*. Cf. also *CT*, VI, 9f.; Lindl, *BA*, IV, 338 ff.; King, *Letters of Hammurabi*, II, 217 ff.; III, 212 ff.; *Chron.*, II, 97 ff., 181 ff. The dates of these have made practically worthless the frequently incorrect numbers of the King list B, Pinches, *PSBA*, II, 21 f.; VI, 193 ff.; Schrader, *SB*, *Berl.*, 1887, 579 ff., 947 ff.; *KB*, II, 286 ff.; Winckler, *Untersuch.*, I ff., 145; Rost, *MVAG*, II, 240; Toffteen, *Chron.*, 22 ff.; Delitzsch, *SB*, *sächs. Akad.*, 1893, 183 ff.; Lehmann, *Hauptprobleme*, 13 ff.; Knudtzon, *Gebete*, I, 60; II, 277; Rogers, *Parallels*, 202.

² Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VIII, 73 f.

³ Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VIII, 68 ff.; Johns, *PSBA*, XXXIII, 98 ff.; XXXIV, 23; Olmstead, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, XX, 281.

until the twenty-fifth that he was declared officially dead.¹ Meanwhile Kish seems once more to have revolted, but as soon as the first successes against Iahzir ilum gave opportunity to attend to troubles in the rear which threatened the lines of communication, Kish was brought under control, and its walls were destroyed. Two years later Sumu la ilu turned north and destroyed and rebuilt the city walls of Kutu, whose late mention shows that after all he had advanced but little his northern frontier. In the same year he made an equally important advance to the south, when he carried out the same procedure with Dur Zakar under the very walls of Nippur. Yet it was not until the next year that he was able to secure control of Barzi or Borsippa, so near to the south that in later times it was reckoned a suburb of Babylon itself. Now at the close of his long reign he might well consider himself the ruler of all the north of Babylonia and could mark the limits of his new dominion by a series of frontier forts.²

With the conquest of Akkad the movement for the unification of Babylonia paused. The reign of Zabum (2175–2163 B.C.), who had been for some time associated with his father,³ was marked only by another destruction of Kazallu, while no wars at all mark that of Apil Sin (2163–2144 B.C.). To judge only from their date lists, all their energies were devoted to building forts such as Kar Shamash or Dur Muti, restoring the walls of Barzi or of Babylon, digging canals, or rebuilding temples in the cities newly won. Yet we cannot fairly call it a period of decline, for future events indicate that it was a time of consolidation and of preparation for the conquest of the remaining portions of Babylonia.⁴

Sin muballit (2144–2124 B.C.) likewise spent the greater part of his reign in peace, yet it is instructive to note the various cities whose walls he rebuilt—Rubatum in his first year, Zaqqar Dadda in his seventh, Dur Sin muballit in his tenth, Marad in his twelfth, and

¹ Cf. the Iahzar ilu under Zabium, Ranke, *Doc.*, 8, n. 1.

² These were Dur Zakar, Dur Padda, Dur Lagaba, Dur Iabugani, Dur Gula duru, and Dur Usi ana Urra, Samsu iluna ins.

³ Oath, Ranke, *Doc.*, No. 9.

⁴ Sippar building, Nabu naid, Ur inscription, III, 29. Schorr, *Urkunden*, 587, gives but seventeen year dates for Apil Sin, but he has omitted by homoeoteleuton year 18, "year after the throne," etc. The king list also gives the summation as 18 years.

Bit Karkarra in his eleventh, for they speak eloquently of advancing empire. In his fourteenth year we find him far in the south of Babylonia destroying the men of Ur, while in his seventeenth we have a capture of Nisin, which may in some fashion be connected with the decline or downfall of the dynasty hailing from that city.¹

Through his identification with the biblical Amraphel and through the discovery of his code of laws his son Hammurapi has become a household word. Thanks to the code and to the enormous number of business documents and letters from his long reign (2124–2081 B.C.), we can now present a picture of the culture of his time which will vie with that of any period in ancient history for completeness. All the more disappointing is it that we know so little of the political history, for Hammurapi, like all the others of his dynasty, has left to posterity in his official inscriptions nothing but resounding inanities, and we are reduced to the provokingly brief date formulas for what little we can glean. In his second year, so these last inform us, "righteousness was established in the land." Our first impression is that we have a reference to the promulgation of the famous code, but this, at least in its present form, is much later.² The fourth year we find Malgia, far to south in the Sealands, in his power,³ and in the next Kashbaran,⁴ though it was not until his seventh that he dared advance against Uruk and Nisin; the latter evidently had been lost since his father had subdued it. Whether the loss of Nisin had been due to its conquest by Rim Sin or not, control of Nisin was a direct threat against Larsa. It is then with no surprise that we find in the following year this threat answered by trouble from the side of Elam, which demanded an expedition into Iamutbal, the home of the

¹ Taken between Adar 6 and Airu 13, as the change in the date formula was made in that interval, Ranke, *Doc.*, 13, n. 1. That the Bel tabi mentioned with Sin muballit, *ibid.*, No. 18, was an Assyrian, is more than doubtful.

² Cf. especially Ungnad, *ZA*, XXIII, 78 f.

³ The variant readings Ma-al-gi-aki, Mal-gi-a, Ma-al-ka-a, Malgumki, Ma-al-gi-i, prove beyond a doubt the existence of a Malgia. I cannot imagine why in year four we should read Ga-gi-a and refer to the convent at Sippar. So far as I know only regular cities had a "great wall." Certainly we would hardly expect it in a convent. Meyer, *Gesch.*, 538, places it near Kerkuk; Jensen, *ZA*, XV, 224, places it in North Babylonia on the basis of IV R², 36, No. 1; the Melishipak kudurru, *Del*, X, 87 ff., shows it near the Sealands and so in the south. Ibiq Ishtar calls himself king of Ma-al-gi-im, and Takil ilishu, the son of Kadi adu, calls himself mighty king, king of Malgim. The references to Ea and Damkina also indicate situation in the south.

⁴ Boissier, *RA*, XI, 161 ff.

Rim Sin dynasty.¹ Malgia revolted under its king Ibiq Ishtar, the son of Apil ilishu, in the tenth year, but was reconquered, its inhabitants and its cattle were carried off, and a new king, Ibiq Adad, was established in his place.² A little later we find the conquest of Rapiqi³ attributed to this same Ibiq Adad, and in the same year we have noted the conquest of Shalibi.⁴ Thus Hammurapi brought under his control the "settlement on the Euphrates"⁵ and could call himself "King of Amurru," or of the Amorite land. Peace was restored to the middle Euphrates, and Babylon was safe from attacks by the Elamites. On the other hand, Rim Sin was clearly too strong to be conquered. Accordingly there is a long period of pause, when only the fortification of cities indicates that the country was not free from the threat of renewed war.⁶

A new period of warfare begins in the thirtieth year of Hammurapi, when, according to our records, the army of Elam was "slain," and this time at least we may be sure that the initiative was taken by the Babylonians. The next year the land of Iamutbal was conquered and its ruler, Rim Sin, was taken prisoner. For a bit of added light we have a letter to Sin iddina, the viceroy of Hammurapi in the south, who had made captive the goddesses of Iamutbal. Like many a later monarch, Hammurapi was not with the army whose exploits he appropriated for himself, so he ordered them to be brought to Babylon. All due respect was paid them in their journeying, but their anger at this mistreatment was not appeased, and this anger was felt by Hammurapi in a defeat at the hands of the Elamites. So another letter from the king orders that they are to be restored to their homes, but this is to be accomplished by the conquest of these localities. Secure in the belief that

¹ "Year the district on the bank of the Shu numun dar canal," read Zunudar, and cf. for further references Scheil, *RA*, XI, 95, evidently unknown to Landesberger, *OLZ*, XIX, 33, who makes Emutbal an error taken from year 31.

² Delaporte, *Cat. Cyl.*, 114; *VS*, I, No. 32; Scheil, *OLZ*, VIII, 512; King, *Chron.*, I, 169, note, identify him with Ibiq Ishtar, but cf. Olmstead, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, XX, 282.

³ Rapiqi is Rāfiqa, the older Raqqa, Yaqut, *s.v.*

⁴ Plausibly identified by Poebel, *Doc.*, 115, with Zelebiyeh, on the left bank of the Euphrates at the narrows, a twin to the still more famous Halebiyeh on the opposite bank. For description cf. especially Miss G. L. Bell, *Amurath to Amurath*, 67 f.; Sarre, *Ztsch. f. Erdkunde*, 1909, 429.

⁵ Code IV, 25.

⁶ Unless the "entering of Umu," cf. Samsi iluna 8, and "great abundance" means a conquest of that city. The wall of Igi harsagga was built in the year 19; of Basu (v.l., Bašu, Bazi, Balum) in 21; and of Sippar in 23 and 25.

now they will be friendly to their erstwhile captors, Hammurapi orders Sin iddinam to "destroy the people with the troops in your hand."¹

With the loss of the dynastic homeland Ur and Larsa fell into the hands of Hammurapi.² In the following year Mankitu went down before him. Then there was peace, marked only by the destruction of the walls of Mari and Malgia, until the thirty-seventh year, when we hear of the war with the army of the Turukku, again to meet us in early Assyrian history,³ and with the men of Kagmun and Su edin or Subartu. In the next came an invasion of Tupliash, the Elamite country, "like a great flood,"⁴ and in the one following the "totality of the enemy" in Su edin was defeated. Then came another period of peace, marked only by the founding of Kar Shamash, of Rabikum on the Euphrates, and of Sippar.⁵

At the close of his reign all Babylonia and much besides were his, even if he had not reached the glories of such a predecessor as Sargon. His possessions are listed in his code of laws, Nippur, Der, Eridu, Ur, Larsa, Uruk, Nishin, Kish, Kutu, Meshlam, Barsip, Dilbat, Kesh, Lagash, Girsu, Hallab,⁶ Karkarra, Adab, Mashkan Shabir, Malgi, the settlements on the Euphrates, Mera, Tutul, and last, but far indeed from least, Ashur and Nineveh,⁷ whose ruler was now Shamshi Adad I, the son of Enlil kapi.⁸ Included in the list are all the famous city-states of early Babylonia. Well might Hammurapi boast, "The separated peoples of the land of Shumer and Akkad I united, with blessings and abundance I endowed them, in peaceful dwellings I made them live."⁹

¹ King, *Letters*, I, xxv ff.; III, 7 ff.

² Chron. K, II, 1, 8 ff. Here Rim Sin is called king of Ur. What are the names of the towns in the last line?

³ Adad nirari I, 1, 13.

⁴ For Ibiq Adad and his son Dadum, kings of Tupliash, cf. Scheil, *OLZ*, XVII, 246 f.; Delaporte, *Rev. Sem.*, XIX, 338 f.; VS, I, 113 f.

⁵ He does not use the title "King of the Four World Regions" in year 25, Ungnad, *Letters*, 30.

⁶ "In the midst of Babylon," Weissbach, *Bab. Miscel.*, No. 15; cf. Olmstead, *Sargon*, 52, n. 1.

⁷ Code I, 50 ff.

⁸ Ranke, *Names*, x; *Doc.*, No. 26.

⁹ Louvre Ins. Aside from the code and the letters we have a large number of inscriptions, mostly collected in King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*; *First Steps*, 5 ff.; Jensen, *KB*, 106 ff. Cf. for individual inscriptions I R. 4, xv; CT, XXI, 40 ff.; Menant, *Ins. de Hammourabi*; *Bab. Chald.*, 109 ff.; *Manuel*, 306 ff.; RT, II, 76 ff.;

Samsu iluna (2081–2043 B.C.) in his first year “exercised lordship over the foreign lands,” and in the next he “established the freedom of Shumer and Akkad.” The succeeding years were years of peace, and in them he had no difficulty in retaining his grip on his father’s kingdom. His troubles began in his ninth year, when for the first time the Kashshites appeared on the eastern boundary. Samsu iluna could congratulate himself on their conquest, but that did not prevent their permanent settlement just over the eastern border, ready to take over the land at the first opportunity. This invasion was seemingly in conjunction with other hostile Elamite elements, for in the next year we find an invasion of Babylonia by the troops of Idamaraz, another country on the eastern frontier. Emutbal, the old home of Rim Sin, was again in arms, and in Babylonia itself Uruk and Nisin revolted. Rim Sin, now almost a centenarian, was proclaimed in South Babylonia, and so good appeared his chances of success that in a suburb of Larsa contracts were made out in duplicate, one in his name and one in the name of Samsu iluna, the legitimate ruler.¹ Larsa remained faithful, Rim Sin was put to death in the palace in which he had been imprisoned since his land had been taken by Hammurapi, and the revolt came to an end.²

Events moved rapidly after this. In the following year Samsu iluna must destroy the walls of Ur and of Uruk; in the twelfth “all the lands revolted” and his date formulas ceased to be used in Larsa; in the next he destroyed Kisurra and Sabum,³ and in the fourteenth we hear of a “usurping king whom the men of Akkad had caused to lead a revolt.” By the sixteenth so great was the danger that

Amlaud, *RT*, I, 181 ff.; *JA*, 1882, 236 ff.; *RA*, II, 4 ff.; Oppert, *Exped.*, I, 267 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 55 ff.; *RP*¹, V, 68 ff.; Lenormant, *Etud.*, II, 355 ff.; Strassmaier, *ZA*, II, 174 ff.; Winckler, *ZA*, II, 118 ff.; *Forsch.*, I, 146, 197 f.; Talbot, *JRAS*, XX, 445 ff.; *Trans. Roy. Soc. Lit.*, VIII, 234; *RP*¹, I, 5 ff.; Delitzsch, *Kossäer*, 73 f.; V. and E. Revillout, *PSBA*, X, 266 ff.; *OBI*, No. 27; *Del*, II, 83 ff.; Rogers, *Parallels*, 242 ff.; Nagel, *BA*, IV, 434 ff.; [Jean, *Lettres de Hammurapi*.] Ungnad, *Letters*, No. 133; Boscawen, *First of Empires*, 163; Clay, *Light*, 130. Laws of Hammurapi, *CT*, XIII, 46 ff. Date formulas, Scheil, *RT*, XXXIV, 105 ff. He is called Adda in Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 200.

¹ Ungnad, *ZA*, XXIII, 73 ff.

² Chron. K. II, I, 13 ff.; cf. for further discussion with bibliography of the whole Rim Sin problem and the question of the chronology, Olmstead, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, XX, 279.

³ Naturally this is neither of the Assyrian Zabs, but the Zab of Babylonia so well known to the Arabic geographers; cf. Yaqut, *s.v.*

a city as far north as Sippar must be fortified. Samsu iluna might try to gloss over this fact by talking of a restoration of its shrine Ebarra and by asserting that its deities, Shamash and Aia, had given him "a righteous scepter to rule the land, a mighty weapon to destroy the foe, to exercise lasting rule over the Four World Regions," but the truth could not be concealed.¹ The dynasty was on the defensive and was fast losing ground. Another spurt marks the seventeenth year, when Emutbal was reconquered and walled, and in the twentieth he fought the "rebellious foreign land." In his twenty-first he must destroy the walls of Shahna and of Zarhanum, and to do so demanded the "frightful might Enlil gave him." Three years later the situation was still more alarming, and Kish, within sight of Babylon, must be fortified with a wall along the Euphrates.² Another invasion came in his twenty-eighth year, when he "captured with his lofty battle mace" Iadi habum and Muti hurshana. For two years there are no new events to date from, and then the city of Saggaratum must be restored to its place. As late as his twenty-sixth year Samsu iluna had been able to bring a monolith from the great mountain of Amurru, that is, probably the Lebanon, but at the close of his reign this route was closed by the invasion of the Amurru people, whose defeat at the hands of the Babylonian monarch in his thirty-sixth year was no guaranty of ultimate success.³

To the south all was now lost, even Nippur falling in the twenty-ninth year into the hands of Iluma ilu,⁴ the first king of the so-called Second Babylonian Dynasty, who dated the beginning of his rule from the preceding year, 2053 B.C. Twice did Samsu iluna march against him, and the second time the battle took place so near the sea that the bodies of the slain fell into the waters.⁵ In the end the situation became so bad that Samsu iluna was forced to rebuild the line of forts erected by his ancestor Sumu la ilu, extending down to the vicinity of Nippur. He might talk of the fear of his royalty covering heaven and earth, but from now on he dared assume only

¹ Poebel, *Texts*, No. 101; *OLZ*, XVIII, 106 ff.; cf. King, *Suppl.*, 37.

² Thureau-Dangin, *OLZ*, XII, 205.

³ What is meant by the formula of year 37, "year the land of Akkad, between Mt. Enti," I do not know.

⁴ Chiera, *Doc.*, 25, 66 f.; cf. Poebel, *ZA*, XX, 232 ff.; *Doc.*, 119, n. 2.

⁵ Chron. K. II, II, 1 ff.

the newly created title "King of Babylon" and the far northern one of "King of the Four World Regions."¹

No claims of victories are made in the date formulas of Abi eshu' (2042–2015 B.C.), and the building of the city Luhaia on the Arahtu Canal points to retrocession of frontiers.² Once he attempted to catch Iluma ilu, and "his heart moved him to dam the Tigris. So he dammed the Tigris, but caught not Iluma ilu."³ Thereupon he erected a fort, named for himself, at the "great gate of the Tigris"⁴ and gave himself up to the service of the cult, to writing dedications for his own statues, and to building shrines in Babylon with names such as might delude the gods of the cities he had lost into believing that they were still in their ancestral homes.⁵ While all around was falling into ruins, business went on as usual, if we may judge from the regular occurrence of the documents.

With Ammi ditana (2015–1978 B.C.) we have a brief renewal of Babylon's power, and there is a certain element of truth in his boasts that he restored the might and loosed the pressure from the land.⁶ In his seventeenth year he conquered Arahah the Shumerian,⁷ and soon after followed the reconquest of Nippur,⁸ the advance culminating in the taking of Nisin in the thirty-seventh year. As a result he could once more call himself "King of Shumer and Akkad," and this he added to his other titles of "King of Babylon, King of Amurru, and King of Kish," implying an empire of no small size.⁹ Meanwhile

¹ Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte*, 74; *Untersuch.*, 140; *KB*, 130 ff.; Strassmaier, *ZA*, III, 153 ff.; cf. 140; Hilprecht, *Explorations*, 480; King, *Letters*, No. 97 ff.; *VS*, I, 33; *CT*, XXI, 47 ff. Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 95, takes the date formulas at face value and thinks it "was indeed a great reign"; but King, *Babylon*, 199 f., is undoubtedly correct in seeing here a period of rapid decline. Unpublished inscriptions, Johns, *Cuneiform Ins.*, 33; defeat of twenty-six usurpers, Weidner, *OLZ*, XVII, 501, n. 2.

² The date formulas are out of order, and it hardly pays to make the attempt at restoration. What the year Adnatumma means is not clear.

³ Chron. K. II, II, 7 ff.

⁴ So also date formula *j*.

⁵ Cf. King, *Babylon*, 205 f.; *Letters*, No. 82 ff.; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 200, 284.

⁶ For chronology of the reigns of Ammi ditana and Ammi zaduga cf. Ungnad, *BA*, VI, 3, 1 ff. *CT*, II, 12, 12, "when Sin and Adad had named thee, my father, to honor, and had rendered thee the yoke," refers to the accession of Ammi ditana, Langdon, *ZA*, XXI, 291.

⁷ Poebel, *Doc.*, 121.

⁸ Erected inscription in Nippur, Hilprecht in Poebel, *Doc.*, 121. This was probably before year 34, King, *Babylon*, 209.

⁹ King, *Letters*, II, No. 100; III, 207 f.; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 199; cf. 144; Pinches, *RP*², V, 102.

fortification had gone on, a fort named for himself on the Zilakum Canal, another on the waters of Enlil, the strengthening of the wall of Ishkun Marduk on the Zilakum, the erection of Mashkan Ammi ditana, and the wall of Kar Shamash on the Euphrates. In his days, if we conjecture rightly, we must place a letter from Iadiri, son of Issi Dagan, and six of his companions from the land of Hanat. They report to the pa official of Martu concerning a revolt against Babylon. "In trust in those fugitives," they say, "they have destroyed the chapel of Marduk who loves you."¹

Of Ammi zaduga (1978–1957 B.C.) we can predicate no warlike acts, in spite of his "loosing the pressure of the land" in his tenth year, the building of a fortress bearing his name "at the mouth of the Euphrates" in the next, and the brightening his land like the sun-god.² All these fine words are forgotten when we observe the sinister presence of the Kashshite soldier of fortune, Warad Ibari, in his service,³ pointing forward to the day when the Kashshite mercenary chiefs should supplant West Semites on the throne of Babylon. Samsu ditana (1957–1926 B.C.) boasts that he restored the dominion with the weapons of Marduk. How complete was in reality the demoralization of the country is shown by a letter from an official in Sippar Ia'rurum, barely a day's journey from Babylon. "The grain which is in the territory should not be left in the open fields at the mercy of the enemy's troops. May our lord give orders that instructions be sent us to open the gate of Shamash and bring the grain into the city." That there actually was a scarcity of grain is shown by the sudden increase in its price, from one and a fifth she per qa in the reign of Ammi zaduga to two in this. At the same time the price of wool fell, and the two facts taken together point conclusively to a condition of affairs in which lands were rapidly going out of cultivation, for sheep can be hurried off before the advancing invader, but grain cannot. In the case of Sippar the king ordered that the grain should be brought in as soon as it was ready, and that then the gates should be guarded.⁴ Unfortunately for him,

¹ Ungnad, *OLZ*, XVII, 343.

² Neo-Babylonian letter copy, *OBI*, No. 129.

³ Ranke, *Doc.*, 8, n. 1.

⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *Hilprecht Vol.*, 161 ff. *Lettres*, No. 8.

the gates of Babylon itself were no longer guarded securely, and the invading Hittites brought the dynasty to an end¹ and carried the city god Marduk, late the ruler of the civilized world, together with his consort Sarpanitum, to Hana, up the Euphrates.² The stratum of ashes which still covers the ruins of the houses occupied during this period is mute witness to the destruction wrought by the Hittites.³

We cannot close our study of this time of complete governmental breakdown without consideration of two dynasties which flourished in the south. One, with its seat in Uruk, has recently become well known in this country by reason of the large number of cones and tablets distributed in the various American museums.⁴ The first and most important ruler of this dynasty was Sin gashid, who calls himself, in addition to the expected "King of Uruk," also "King of Amnanu."⁵ Issued under his direction was a cone which gives a fixed tariff for various commodities and thus forms a basis for a study of the economics of the period.⁶ Another king of this dynasty is the Sin gamil, in whose honor a temple was erected to Nergal in Usipara by Anam, the son of Bel shemea.⁷ In this record he appears as the gish dubba official; in another he is Adda or father of the people of Uruk, and as such he restores the city walls, whose origin he traces back to Gilgamesh, the greatest of Uruk's mythical kings.⁸ In still others he calls himself the "true shepherd of Uruk, the mighty seer,

¹ Chron. II, 10. I must confess to much sympathy with the point of view of Rogers, *Hist.*, II, 97, who does not consider the Hittites responsible. It is true that we cannot bring this fact into connection with any other known one with regard to them; in fact, it is by centuries the oldest reference to the Hittites.

² Agum kakrime, I, 44 ff.; cf. King, *Chron.*, I, 73.

³ Koldewey, *Babylon*, 240.

⁴ The Oriental Museum of the University of Illinois, for example, has three tablets and five cones.

⁵ Cf. the Ammananu conquered by Nebuchadnezzar II, Strassmaier, *Hebr.*, IX, 4 f.; Amnanu also occurs in the Bilingual of Shamash shum ukin. For Sippar of the god Amnanu cf. the Nabunaid ins., Scheil, *RT*, XVIII, 19.

⁶ Exhaustive study of inscriptions of Sin gashid, G. B. Duncan, *AJSL*, XXXI, 215 ff. Cf. also I R. 3, viii; IV R². 35, 3; *CT*, XXI, 12 ff.; Smith, *TSBA*, I, 41; Menant, *Bab. Chald.*, 69; Lenormant, *Etud.*, 88, 324 ff.; *Choix*, No. 64; Schrader, *ZDMG*, XXIX, 40 ff.; Winckler, *KB*, 82 ff.; Pinches, *Bab. Or. Rec.*, I, 8 ff.; Radau, *Hist.*, 225 ff.; *SAK*, 220 ff.; King, *PSBA*, XXXVII, 22 ff.; *Babylon*, op. p. 210; Olmstead, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, XX, 283; Langdon, *AJSL*, XXXIV, 123.

⁷ Winckler, *KB*, 84 ff.; *CT*, XXI, 17; *SAK*, 222 f.; cf. Scheil, *RA*, XII, 193.

⁸ *OBI*, No. 26; Hommel, *PSBA*, XVI, 13; Hilprecht, *Assyriaca*, 101; Winckler, *Forsch.*, I, 274; Radau, *Hist.*, 226, n. 2; Jensen, *KB*, VI, 268 f.

the obedient one of the gods, the beloved son of Innanna."¹ Thus in one he frankly acknowledges the kingship of Sin gamil; in the others he as carefully refrains from calling himself king, though he is clearly the actual ruler. At last he seems to have tired of being the power behind the throne, even with that title of Adda which had been glorified by Kudur Mabug and Hammurapi, for one date formula tells of the year when he formally assumed the royal name.² We have here an obvious transition to a dynasty with more promise of life. There is another hint of troublous times, for Anam restores the temple of Innanna, destroyed, perhaps, in a war with the Sealand kings. Perhaps we may assign to this dynasty Arad Shasha, whose accession to royal power is given in another date formula.³

In this period of almost complete breakdown only the kings of the Sealands were left to represent in any degree a central authority, and it is for this reason alone that later scribes listed them as the Second Babylonian Dynasty, for it is more than doubtful that they held sway as far north as Babylon. Practically our whole information comes from the late king lists, and in them the names are uncertain, and the length of reign is often demonstrably incorrect.⁴ The first king, Iluma ilu, whom we have already met, is given sixty years, Itti ili nibi fifty-five, and Damiq ilishu thirty-six. So long a period of rule for three successors is extremely unlikely, and can hardly be squeezed into the time allowed by other data. Then come Ishki bal with fifteen years, his brother Shushi with twenty-seven, Gul kishar, who is more real because he is named in a later boundary inscription,⁵ with fifty-five, his son Peshgal daramash with fifty, Adara kalama with twenty-eight, Akur ul ana with twenty-six, Melam kurkurra with seven, and Ea gamil with nine. In the first part of the list the rulers have Semitic names, in the second Shumerian. Perhaps we have a change of dynasty within the "Dynasty" arranged by later antiquarians. We close this dark period with the consciousness that again a political break is followed by a break in the culture, and that when the curtain rises we shall be in a new world.

¹ Clay, *Miscel. Ins.*, No. 35 f.; cf. Johns, *AJSL*, XXX, 290 f.

² Scheil, *OLZ*, VIII, 351; Thureau-Dangin, *RA*, VI, 137; *SAK*, 238. ³ *SAK*, 238.

⁴ King lists A, B; for discussion cf. Olmstead, *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, XX, 283.

⁵ Enlil nadin apal kudurru; cf. Jensen, *ZA*, VII, 220 ff.